



*George Washington Flowers
Memorial Collection*

DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

ESTABLISHED BY THE
FAMILY OF
COLONEL FLOWERS

ANTI-CHRISTIAN
SOCIOLOGY
AS TAUGHT IN
The Journal of Social Forces
PRESENTING
A Question For North Carolina
Christians

BY REV. WILLIAM P. McCORKLE

(Revised Edition)

"Our great commonwealth is the child of Christianity; it may with equal truth be asserted that modern civilization sprang into life with our religion; and faith in its principles is the life-boat on which humanity has at divers times escaped the most threatening perils."—Bancroft.

BURLINGTON, N. C.

Published For The Author By

A. D. PATE & CO., Printers

FOREWORD

The writer some months ago called attention to the agnostic and materialistic positions assumed by two northern writers in their papers published in the January number of the Journal of Social Forces. The "Journal" is a sociological magazine published under the auspices of the University of North Carolina. Protests against the purveying of such anti-christian sentiment in university publications were elicited from two associations of ministers of all denominations, and from two Presbyteries of the Synod of North Carolina. Further, in an article in the Charlotte Sunday Observer, he reviewed the paper of Judge R. W. Winston, which appeared in the November (1924) number of the magazine, and was entitled, "The Noose of Darwin and the Neck of Orthodoxy." He brought out two facts—that Judge Winston declared in sympathy with Ingersoll, that "orthodoxy must accept evolution or else plant itself upon the miraculous, the impossible," and that science had left of the whole Bible only "the four gospels and the epistles of Paul," —all the rest, the Judge would have us understand, having been finally and hopelessly discredited. A synopsis of the Judge's article will accompany this pamphlet.

The writer is a friend of the University. As a North Carolinian by adoption, having spent some twenty-six years of his ministry in this State; as one whose home is in North Carolina; and above all, as a believer in the Christian revelation, he is interested in all that concerns our great State. He is proud of our great University—of its high standing, of its honorable record, of its phenomenal growth, of its past and potential usefulness, and of the high personal character of its faculty. He believes that the highest interests of the University will be conserved and promoted by such united and determined action on the part of its faculty, alumni and trustees, and by the people of the State, as shall make it certain that the University shall stand true for all time to the Christian religion. He does not believe that anything could be more harmful to the University,

either as to its **esprit du corps** or as to its reputation among Christian people within and without our State, than the policy heretofore pursued by the editors of the Journal of Social Forces—that of permitting their magazine to be used by others as a medium for the dissemination of anti-christian, agnostic, materialistic and socialistic views.

This is no question of “academic freedom,” much less of “freedom of conscience.” Gentlemen unconnected with the University have an unquestioned right to publish anything they please, provided only it does not violate the laws of the State and of the nation. But from its beginning the University of North Carolina has stood for the Christian religion—not for any particular sect or faction of Christians, but for the Christian religion in its broad, inclusive aspect, as implying faith in God, faith in the Bible as a divine revelation, and faith in Jesus Christ as the Divine Savior of the world. In the infancy of the institution a professor was discharged because, being a disciple of Thomas Paine, he went so far as to advocate the views of Paine and to deny the divine authority of the moral law as revealed in the Scriptures. Should a professor in any of our State schools announce himself an agnostic, and claim the right to advocate agnosticism in public address or through the public prints, it is probable that as a matter of course, the trustees of that school would now proceed as the Trustees of the University did more than a hundred years ago. Believing that the welfare of the State and of the University was bound up in the stand they should take in behalf of the Bible, and of the morality which inculcates, they dismissed the infidel professor.

Editors are responsible for the policy and tone of their publications. If any article slandering a citizen of North Carolina should appear in a University publication, even if written by some one not connected with the University, the editors would be held responsible under the law for publishing the slander, as the slanderer would be held responsible for writing and printing it. “Qui facit per alium facit per se.” When, therefore, any journal published by the University, and edited by professors or students, gives currency to attacks on the Christian religion, arguments against the

Christian revelation, against the sanctity of the moral law revealed in the Scriptures, against the immortality of the soul, etc., such a policy ought to be condemned alike by the faculty and alumni of the University, by the trustees, and by the Christian public, and such practice should be stopped by the proper authorities.

Professors in our State schools are under solemn obligation to keep faith with the Christian public whose employees they are. Ours is a Christian commonwealth. Our University is a Christian institution. Further, if there be a division among Christians—as, for instance, between “modernists” and “fundamentalists”—the University must stand for Christianity without allowing itself to become embroiled in a factional contest between two Christian parties. Just as in politics the University has no policy save to stand for honesty and patriotism, so in its religious policy, it seems to me, the University should stand for Bible Christianity in its historic sense, without lending its influence to the aid of a faction or a sect. And if it should oppose anything, publicly and officially, alike in the public utterances of its faculty and in the publications issued under its imprimatur, it ought to stand outright for Christianity as against infidelity in all its forms.

Wm. P. McCorkle.

Burlington, N. C.

(1853-1923)

ANTI-CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY

I.—AN AMBITIOUS SCIENCE

Sociology is the science of human society. Hence it embraces all that history which has to do with the origin and development of social customs, of moral ideas, and of government. Since religion is among those "social forces" which have had much to do in the past, and will have much to do in the future with the development of human society, it becomes in part the province of sociology (?) to study the origins of religious doctrines and practices, as bearing upon the history of society, and as explaining much that exists today. It is of prime importance, therefore, that the approach to the study of religion from the sociological point of view should be sympathetic, and if the teacher and authors of text-books are Christians, there will be no attempt to discredit and set aside the Christian revelation in the name of science. If the subject is approached in a skeptical, unfriendly spirit, as regards Christianity, the professor of sociology becomes, ipso facto, an apostle of unbelief, the class in sociology a school of infidelity, and the text-books and periodicals used as auxiliary to the course the seed and stimuli of Ingersollism.

The Christian revelation assumes the existence of God as the necessary basis of all being. Its first announcement is the fact of the creation of the universe by God Himself. The religion of Christ founds upon the truth of this fact. Further, it declares the fact of a divine revelation in the infancy of the human race, and a progressive revelation through prophets during the ages afterward, until that revelation culminated in the birth, character, life, teachings, miracles, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ. In His life, miracles, sayings, death and resurrection, the apostles found their gospel. It was none other than the gospel of Jesus. They added no new doctrines to those which He proclaimed, required no faith or obedience which He had not declared obligatory upon His disciples. It behooves the Christian teacher of sociology, therefore, to let these facts have full force and bearing in his entire course of in-

struction as to the origins of the Christian religion. An attitude of skepticism or of indifference here, cannot fail to be injurious in the highest degree to the Christian faith and character of his students.

There is a method of teaching the doctrine of evolution that does not involve necessarily a denial of the above-named Christian verities. The book of Genesis does not tell us how man was made. No church and no State can undertake to give a final and authoritative interpretation of the story of Eden. There is abundant room for differences of opinion among the most devout Christians, and the writer dares not deny to his brethren the right of free interpretation which he claims for himself. But all Christians who accept that story as a part of the Word of God, revealed to teach us "what man is to believe concerning God and what duties God requires of man," are agreed that here we have an inspired account of the first things in human history—the first man and the first woman, the first marriage, the first home, the first revelation of God and of duty, the first manifestation of the devil, the first temptation, the first sin and the consequent fall of the race, the first shame, the first clothing, the first promise of redemption, the first judgment upon man for sin. These are facts unquestionably revealed, apart from all questions as to the rhetoric of the sacred text. Here are facts which the prying research of science cannot disprove, a record which may not be dismissed as a mere childish legend. Here begins that "testimony of Jesus," which is "the spirit of prophecy." To dismiss it as a baseless myth, is to assail the very foundation of the faith. To deny the agency of an immanent and personal God in creation and in the development of man and of society, is frankly to deny the whole truth of Christianity.

These considerations prepare us for the definition and statements following, which show the nature of sociology as conceived by the writers quoted, and the very broad and ambitious program which Darwinian sociologists are attempting to carry out. We find the following statements in the May (1925) number of the Journal of Social Forces:

1. Page 607-8. **Sociology defined.** "An attempt to account for the origin, growth, structure and activities of

society, by the operation of physical, vital and psychical causes working together in a process of evolution." This definition is agnostic. It leaves God out of "the process."

2. **The place and function of sociology in education indicated.** Page 609. "The study of the group will yet revolutionize the whole art of education." Sociology "is related to educational organization and administration in the most intimate way . . . the guide and foundation of each." Hence it must seek to control educational objectives. Page 610: "Sociology, as the scientific study of society, its forces and potentialities, is the only science to which the educator may reasonably look for a social ideal which is not a mere dream, but possible of realization." This intimates that the Christian ideal of society is "a mere dream," and impossible of realization. Sociology must be relied on to furnish a better ideal than can be found in the Scriptures. Still further, sociology must determine school curricula and pave the way for the re-organization of society on a scientific basis. P. 611: "The first requirement in the construction of an educational curriculum is a sociological one, a scientific conception of what society may and ought to be." . . "Sociology may render still another important service by showing not only what knowledge is of most worth, but the order in which such knowledge is most easily presented. . . Sociology, . . along with biology and psychology, is really the foundation of educational method." . . "Discipline is chiefly concerned with selective and repetitive processes . . it inheres in curricular and extra-curricular activities. The relation of sociology to discipline, then, is exactly the same as with respect to the other aspects of education."

In a word, then, sociology proposes to furnish mankind with a new social ideal, and to control the education of our youth so as to pave the way for a scientific re-organization of society. That other sociologists agree with the writer above quoted, will appear in the following pages.

II.—RELIGION AS VIEWED BY DARWINIAN SOCIOLOGISTS

The following expressions, let it be noted, are from Northern writers, contributors—some of them “contributing editors”—on the corps of the Journal of Social Forces. While no professor of the University of North Carolina has given utterance to such views, as far as this writer is aware, the propriety of publishing such matter in a magazine issued under the auspices of our University may well be questioned. The injection of such wholesale doubts as to the truth of Christianity into the minds of students of sociology in our own State and elsewhere can hardly be a matter of indifference to any earnest Christian. Our boys and girls will come in contact with infidelity soon enough, when they leave school and go out to their life-struggle in the world. Ought it not to be our object to make their education prepare them not only for useful citizenship, but for “giving a reason for the hope that is in them,” and to qualify them to witness for the truth as it is in Jesus? “Forewarned is forearmed.” Religion has its place in education. But to pour infidel notions into the receptive minds of young men and women in the name of science is a crime against immortal souls.

In the review section of the Journal of Social Forces for May, 1925, I find the folowing propositions and intimations:

1. **Orthodoxy of any type is distasteful to “the strictly scientific mind.”** Dr. F. H. Hankins, a corresponding editor, writes (P. 748) reviewing “Christianity and Modern Thought” by Gabriel:—“The ‘modern thought’ of the title is that brand of modern thought which is acceptable to an advanced orthodoxy this will not suit the natives of the palmetto groves or the short grass prairies it will not suit the strictly scientific mind either.”

2. **“Creationism,” together with the immanence and personality of God, all discarded.** “Prof. Lull in ‘Evolutionism and Religion’ discards the doctrine of creationism as out of harmony with the universality of cause and effect as pointed out by science, but falls back on the assumption of

an immanent God. Only the will to believe can be satisfied with such an easy evasion of the really important question, ‘But is this God a personal spirit to which one can have recourse in time of need?’”

Here the writer intimates his own unbelief by putting it in an interrogatory form. One seems to hear the echo of the devil’s question in Eden—“Hath God said?”

3. **Faith in immortality waived aside as not incentive to right living.** P. 748. Criticising Dean Sperry’s argument that the fact of immortality is essential to give meaning to this life, and quoting his words, “The alternative to such projection of the immediate experience into the future is sheer irrationality,” Hankins remarks, dryly.

“That is one way of looking at the matter. A large number of the best minds mankind has yet produced have found this life, understood in relation to nature, full of meaning and beauty in itself. But one can only express a view-point and let it go at that. . . . This book is too much concerned with theology to have any meaning except for those already imbued with the faith.”

Here is an echo of Hume’s sneers at “the grace of faith.”

4. **Unbelief in supernatural intimated.** P. 748. “Dean Matthews defines religion as the ‘complex of those social acts by which a group undertakes to ward off the anger and gain the help of those superhuman and not understood elements upon which it depends.’” This appears he adds, to be “an acceptable definition, although one notes in passing the ambiguity which lurks in the word ‘superhuman.’ If by this is meant the natural forces which at any time are beyond human control, one has a naturalistic conception of religion; but if there is meant spiritual or transcendental powers, then one has quite a different thing, the implication of supernatural deities conceived as furnishing the basis for religious beliefs and acts.” Here “naturalistic” means materialistic and such a view precludes any faith in supernatural beings. This is made sufficiently plain by the writer on the next page.

5. **Sociologists not interested in “assumption of a personal God.”** P. 749. “If the sociologist is right in viewing religion as a purely natural social phenomenon understand-

able in its entirety through individual and group psychology, then he can have little interest in the query ‘Is the religious view of life, that is, the assumption of a personal God, consistent with modern science?’” Note here the significance of the term “assumption of a personal God.” Materialistic science which is the basis of Darwinian sociology knows nothing of a personal God. It views religion “as a purely natural social phenomenon,” to be explained by “individual and group psychology,” refusing to acknowledge the presence and agency of a Divine Spirit. Were one to admit that God has anything to do with religious experience, it would not, of course, be “purely natural.” “Science” can not admit the presence and activity of a personal God!

Dr. Hankins repeats the same intimation in discussing Dean Matthews’ assertion that religion can be put to the experimental test. “What one misses here” says Hankins, “is any attempt at a natural science explanation of such experiences.” Natural science must explain it all. There must be no admission of any divine revelation or supernatural agency!

6. P. 749. Religious experience ridiculed, and an argument against Christianity urged. “If they (religious experiences) are to be considered adequate to establish the existence of the supernatural powers believed in, then the world is full of spirits, ghosts, demons, angels, gods and devils, all capable of producing genuine **bona fide** religious thrills, quality and quantity dependent upon the size of the deity and the depth of the faith of the believer.” What strength of logic and what delicious scientific humor! Assuming that all religious experience is simply a matter of “thrill,” whether among Christians or heathen, the writer attempts to refute Christianity by the method of *reductio ad absurdum*. Heathen experiences produce “genuine **bona fide** religious thrills” (?) as well as Christian experiences; therefore science can put no confidence in any!

7. The question of immortality pronounced a matter of indifference to the scientific mind, and then sneered at. P. 749. “Canon Barnes and Principal Galloway unite in saying that ‘if we restrict ourselves to what science and metaphysics can tell us, the problem of life after death

is likely to end in a note of uncertainty.' But the former joins with Rudolph Eucken in holding . . . that if the universe be conceived as rational, then the destruction of the human personality after death would be irrational. The indifferent mind cannot follow such reasoning, and must feel that the good professors are merely whistling to keep up their courage." Which means that Christian apologetes of that type are sadly in the dark and very much frightened by scientific opposition! To the same effect is our reviewer's criticism of Macintyre's argument for immortality that one may accept the doctrine that physical man evolved from the brutes, but his evolution is now continuing on the psychic plane so that man is becoming more and more spiritually-minded with the passing of generations. "This," he says, "is pretty hard on our billions of forebears, but if the process succeeds in supplying our descendants with genuine spiritual souls, metaphysically integrated, but physically non-existent, we need not be overcritical." This is a sneer at the doctrine that man may acquire, or has acquired an immortal soul, even when urged on evolutionary grounds.

8. A Materialistic argument against immortality. P. 750. In a nutshell this argument is this:

Nature furnishes no instance of life continuing after death. Life is known only in connection with organic structures; is, in fact, only the functioning of such structures, disappearing inevitably with their serious alteration or destruction. The only immortality known to science is the continuance of life through reproduction of cells,—the physical continuity of the stream of life. Mind is unknown and unthinkable in realistic terms apart from nerve structure. When that is destroyed ,there is and can be, no mind. Finally, physical research has failed to produce a single case of spirit manifestation.

All which intimates that the only possibility of immortality that man may know is such immortality as is implied in the continuance of individual life through one's offspring. No personal immortality can be admitted by this Darwinian sociologist.

9. **The possibility of divine revelation denied.** Proceeding, the writer asserts that "there are no means whereby pure and genuine spirit can make itself manifest to man." That is, a Divine Spirit could not if He would reveal Himself to man.

10. **Faith in personal immortality of the soul is surrendered with increasing knowledge.** "Souls become more and more shadowy with the growth of knowledge and sophistication until in a strictly scientific view, they disappear altogether in a sort of universal energy, an impersonal Nirvana, where personality and identity are both lost at once." Further, Dr. Hankins approves Prof. Tsanoff's positions as "quite in harmony with the finest scientific and philosophical tradition." Why? "He recognizes that the crude popular conceptions of a biological or psychological existence of the identical and identifiable person **in saecula saeculorum**, in some material or thinly material form are no longer worth arguing." Bating what the reviewer says as to the "material or thinly material form" of souls departed as we conceive them, the "crude popular conceptions" of immortal spirits are simply the teachings of the Scriptures and of Christ on that subject. But it is not "worth arguing." Science has now, finally and forever, settled the question for all intelligent persons!

Again: Referring to Tsanoff's argument that the striving for moral perfection which man alone manifests, is at once evidence of the unity and uniqueness of the human personality, and hence its claim to immortality, our reviewer says: "Tsanoff admits that this conclusion rests on hope and an act of faith and hence he will not expect to convince the scientific." Bearing in mind the assertion of Barnes in the January number, that Christianity has retarded the progress of the race, we would judge that it is a settled conviction with such men that the Christian religion in all its items of faith is irrational and unscientific, and that the sooner it is laughed out of the world as a mere congeries of superstitions, the better it will be for the progress of science, and of mankind through the advance of science. That general abandonment of Christianity by the people would great-

ly increase the vogue and popularity of evolutionary sociology, is beyond question.

11. **Faith in immortality is opposed to a really intelligent mode of living.** P. 751. Proceeding, Hankins says, "The belief in a future life is not essential to give meaning to this one. There is, in fact, a direct antithesis between the two lives. The less the one this side the grave means, the more the one on the other side is glorified. But when this life becomes filled with vivid reality, the other loses interest. It is safe to say that a really intelligent mode of living here and now is not affected in the slightest degree by any belief concerning the hereafter." Which intimates plainly that the people who are superstitious enough to sing

"A charge to keep I have,
 A God to glorify,
A never-dying soul to save
 And fit it for the sky"

are not really intelligent!

12. **An intimation of atheism.** P. 751. Pronouncing Prof. Selbie's "Psychology of Religion" "a welcome addition to the literature of religious psychology," our reviewer criticises the author for rejecting "the psycho-analytic interpretation of many religious phenomena. Thus when Jung declares that the idea of God is merely an infantile projection from our consciousness and thus denies the existence of God, Prof. Selbie replies that the existence of God is definitely proven to the religious person by his own experience, his consciousness of contact and communion with him. But this is an exceedingly naive reply." Which is to say, stupid! Proceeding, our reviewer says, "On this ground the existence of every god, devil and ghost ever believed in by primitive man would be proven, for they all made themselves clear to the consciousness of the individual believer. There is in fact in Prof. Selbie's own volume abundant material for the interpretation of the whole religious experiences in terms of individual and social psychology without any resort to supernatural influences."

The next volume reviewed is one of which "much the same may be said." It is the volume of Dean Matthews,

of King's College, London, on "The Psychological Approach to Religion."

"In a clear and candid manner he discusses the psychology of belief in God, conversion and immortality. He states all the common sense arguments and some of the scientific ones, only to reject them on the ground that these matters are in the last analysis metaphysical in nature and therefore psychology cannot have the final voice. He admits that psychology points to the dependence of the soul on the body and this makes the assumption of the separate existence of the soul precarious; but he takes some comfort in the assumption of the interaction of mind and body which psychology cannot at least wholly disprove; and this gives some ground for the hope that the soul is capable of a free and independent existence. In a word he admits that science furnishes scant basis for the belief in immortality and therefore he thinks it wise to take refuge in metaphysics where each may indulge his own fancies without fear of being embarrassed by facts."

Aside from showing the weakness of the "Modernist" apologetic, this criticism shows how a true Darwinian hesitates to accept any proofs of God, or of immortality. Dean Matthews finds "some ground" for his faith; takes "some comfort" in an assumption; and at last takes refuge in metaphysics where one cannot be embarrassed by facts! Science furnishes scant basis for any faith in immortality!

Note here also another expression of contempt for metaphysics. The psychology of which author and reviewer both speak is the new Spencerian psychology which is materialistic throughout, and is based on evolutionary assumptions. Materialistic and agnostic science does not and can not admit the existence of a soul in man, considered as an intellectual, moral and spiritual entity, separable from "somatic energy."

13. If man can be shown to be immortal, the same arguments will prove the immortality of animals of "many sorts from insects up." P. 752, review of "Passing of Phantoms" by Patten.

"He not only argues for the existence of mind throughout living things, but advances a quantity of evidence for the evolution of mind from plant to man, and of morals from most rudimentary beginnings to the highly complicated human systems. Human consciousness can not be set apart from the rest of nature as something of a special sort. . . . Substantially all the arguments for human immortality must apply also to animals of many sorts from insects up. There is no escape from this except in assumptions which make man a special

creation, assumptions from which the belief in human immortality cannot be deduced. This is, of course, a question begging solution.” . . .

14. Non-Superstitious Man will not trouble himself about God or Immortality. Proceeding Dr. Hankins says:

“Consciousness is an attribute of highly complex nervous structures, as strength is the functioning of living muscular tissues. But if”—as the writer strongly intimates is the case—“the soul be not immortal, what of moral values and the meaning of life? Patten finds such values and meaning inherent in the processes and values of life itself. Indeed he concludes that the Non-Superstitious Man who is evolving in our scientific age can find in these processes ‘fundamental rules of morality apart from imaginative conception of the supernatural.’ This is sufficiently obvious to those who have sufficient mental freedom to see it; to others it will be meaningless.”

Here the title of the book reviewed shows its materialistic nature and its anti-Christian animus, and the reviewer endorses Mr. Patten emphatically, with a sneer at the mental slavery of those who do not agree that the supernatural is only an “imaginative conception.”

15. God and immortality find no support in science.
F. 752. “One expects from Bertrand Russell a viewpoint thoroughly in harmony with the logic of modern science. ‘What I Believe’ is not only written from such a viewpoint, but is one of the clearest, most readable and most constructive utterances which has come from Russell for a long time.” Why such unstinted praise? Perhaps the next sentence will explain the approbation of the agnostic reviewer. “At the very outset he rejects both God and immortality as finding no support in science. Moreover he finds that neither is essential to religion because neither is found in Buddhism. In view of the fact that thinking and personality are based on brain structure and functions, he finds it inconceivable that these activities should persist after death. He finds that religion is based on an original fear of nature; but all fear is bad and therefore”—

16. “Religion has stultified the human mind, and hindered the development of the human personality.” . . .
Further, says our reviewer, with cordial approval, “he finds that traditional morality is too largely compounded of superstitious mandates from the gods. They therefore un-

necessarily restrain individuals and produce a warping of personalities and a cultivation of mutual misunderstandings and hatreds which fill the world with suspicions and terrors."

Christianity is responsible for hatreds etc.! It will never do to tell our young students of sociology that God gave the ten commandments to Moses to be made known to Israel. Such superstitious mandates of the gods "warp the human personality!" No skeptic or atheist was ever satisfied with the ten commandments. As some old divine said, "A bad heart is the greatest of all arguments against the Bible."

17. Authority of conscience derided. "Conscience is a most fallacious guide, since it consists of vague reminiscences of precepts heard in early youth, so that it is never wiser than its possessor's nurse or mother." Which implies that God did not reveal any moral law, and conscience is not a faculty of moral judgment divinely implanted in man, which witnesses to the authority and righteousness of His law!

18. Religion unnecessary for the right ordering of one's life. "To live a good life in the fullest sense, a man must have a good education, friends, love, children if he desires them," (not necessarily a wife, of course, since God never revealed any law for our guidance in such matters), "a sufficient income to keep him from want and grave anxiety, good health, and work which is not uninteresting. All these things in varying degree depend upon the community, and are helped or hindered by political events. The good life must be lived in a good society, and is not fully possible otherwise."

This is the highest ideal materialism offers. David Livingstone, Henry Martyn, Adoniram Judson, and all the host of Christian missionaries, not to speak of prophets and saints and martyrs, all failed to live "the good life," and as man is not immortal, according to the author and reviewer, they missed all the good that was possible to them. It is mere folly even to desire to join "the choir invisible, whose music is the gladness of the world," and in order to this deny

one's self. There is no living the good life unless you have a "good time."

Proceeding, our reviewer says, with relish, "Instead, then of the mixture of preaching and bribery which is at the basis of present moral training, Russell would substitute an active cultivation of helpfulness and courage on the basis of a scientific knowledge of individual and social psychology. He would organize society and tradition so as to combat fear,—fear both of the living and the dead." Fear of the living would include the living God if there be one. Tradition is to be "organized," which is euphemism for getting rid of the religion of the Bible. Rid men of the idea that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the Holy One is understanding." Why? He gives the scientific reason: "Through science it should be possible in the coming generation to enable the vast majority of people to live the good life through . . . knowledge, self-control and that benevolent understanding which produces harmony among men."

19. Science alone can furnish moral guidance for mankind. P. 753. "Russell . . . implies more than once that there is no basis for ethical codes except individual or human desires. . . . There is in fact an objective test of moral codes and precepts, because in the long run those individuals, families and societies which achieve health, vigor and intelligent command over the essential conditions of life persist. Science alone can point the way to such an ethical code." Here is another implication that God never did reveal any moral law for man to obey. This squares with the proposition made by Dr. Barnes in the January number of the Journal of Social Forces, that a committee of scientific experts be appointed to compile such a code. It will be a substitute for the ten commandments and for the Sermon on the Mount, especially in those portions in which the Master alludes to lying, fornication and adultery. Such commandments "cramp the human personality."

20. Affirms that historic Christianity is itself a plagiarism and the historic existence of Jesus doubtful. Reviewing Churchward's "Origin and Evolution of Religion,"

Prof. Hankins criticises the author for his failure to give proofs of his many assertions, yet shows decided relish for his outspoken infidelity. While he ridicules the author's reasons for believing that man has a soul (P. 756) he lets it appear that he is impressed with Churchward's attempt to show that Christianity copied from ancient Egyptian heathenism. "Every student of religious phenomena will wish to read it," he says. Proceeding, he gives the parallel which Churchward claims to have established between Horus and Jesus, extending from pre-existence and divinity to annunciation, miraculous conception, birth and adoration, miracles, says, sacrificial death, and resurrection. Our reviewer concludes with a hint that possibly Jesus never lived, and that in any event the doctrines of Christianity are without divine sanction. "Whether the author is correct in denying the historic existence of Jesus (P. 756) he has made it plain that no such existence was necessary to the development of such a body of religious doctrines as centered about him." Which is to say, that in any event, Christianity is without divine authority. Further, says our reviewer, "When one realizes the ease of myth manufacture and transference, that the first mention of Jesus is in Paul's epistle to the Thessalonians about twenty years after the crucifixion is supposed (sic) to have occurred, and that the only mention of him as an assumed (sic) historical character is in the sacred writings themselves,"—which, as we have seen, is not a thing which appeals at all to the "strictly scientific mind,"—"and that the Savior God was an ancient and wide-spread feature of religious tradition . . . one realizes that Christian doctrine and practice are at least a compound of many older religious elements."

21. **Encourages opposition to prohibition.** I pass over the first review article of Dr. Parshley on "Some Aspects of Sin," with its decidedly socialistic flavor, which is common to all the Northern and Western writers who favor the Journal of Social Forces with their essays, pausing only to quote his remark (757) in regard to prohibition, referring to the measures of repeal urged by the author: "Apparently he has never heard of lapsed legislation." This intimates that eventually prohibition will simply be abandoned without further legislation, the law becoming a dead letter.

22. Masturbation advised. Reviewing "Sex and Life" by Dr. W. F. Robie, which he commends as showing "a great deal of good sense and good science . . ." he tacitly endorses Dr. Robie's approval of "auto-erotism"—in plain English, self-abuse—as "providentially available **faute de mieux**." Here a commendation of a beastly and destructive vice is given without dissent. Can anybody tell why?

23. Opposition to any form of Christianity expressed. Pp. 759 et seq. Dr. J. S. Bixler's paper, "Some Aspects of Modernism" is valuable, as showing the futility of the modernist apologetic as against the oppositions of Darwinism. Reviewing Dr. Fosdick's "Modern Uses of the Bible" and Dean Matthews' "Faith of Modernism" he remarks that "it seems hardly possible that a fair-minded person could read either book and remain a fundamentalist." Will he then become a modernist? No.

"The canons of reasonableness and abiding human value which these writers have set up might point the way to freedom not only from the limitations of fundamentalism, but from those of Christianity itself in its historical and particularistic aspect. Dr. Fosdick's position seems especially ambiguous on this point. The Bible is held up because it is the repository of truths that are eternal. But no hint is given of the eternal truths which are found outside the Bible. The writer gives the impression of being able to find value only in that which is both abiding and **Biblical**. . . . But it may be queried whether the weakest place in the modernist position is not this tendency to cling to a particularistic view when the criteria by which the view is reached are universal. The same problem recurs in the chapters on Jesus. We must adore him, says Dr. Fosdick, because He brings a life-bringing experience of the divine. But is this experience one that can be called life-bringing because through some higher authority of its own it transcends and supersedes our human categories [modes of thought], or is it because it harmoniously fits and effectively responds to the reason and conscience which are our mental and moral equipment as human beings? If the former, why make permanence and pertinence to human need the criteria? If the latter, why look to Jesus alone for an experience that is life-bringing?"

Let Modernists handle this dilemma as best they can. It holds no terrors for any man who believes with all his heart that "there is no other name given under heaven whereby we may be saved but the name of Jesus."

24. The religion of the future will be a hodge-podge of

all religions, past and present, and Christianity will be superceded. Our reviewer goes on to say:

"Dean Matthews would probably reply that it is only in the Christian community that we find the religious experience which truly satisfies. But a large part of the race has found satisfaction in other groups (sociological for religious or other communities), and the Christian community has its debit and credit account. Although syncretistic and eclectic movements have not succeeded in the past, it seems probable that the religion of the future will be eclectic at least in being untrammeled by the limitations of any one historic movement, and free to adopt whatever of value it can find in any faith."

Whatever it may be, the religion of the future cannot be Christianity!

25. Teachers and parents urged to educate children not to believe in the supernatural and the miraculous.

Dr. Bixler commends Prof. Streibert's book, "Youth and the Bible" as "definite and compelling." P. 768. Why? "As a college teacher of the Bible she has found her work hampered by the crude notions of Biblical material and outmoded conceptions of religion which the students have brought to the class-room." There must be a change, he insists, in the methods of primary religious education. "From the beginning the child must learn to expect to find in the Bible the evidence of its authors' frailty. He must also learn not to associate religion with the miraculous and supernatural. God is immanent in nature and in man. He is revealed most adequately in the least limited forms of life. Religion is the attitude of conscious co-operation with the morally achieving spirit of the universe." He approves the author's suggestion that "antiquated sections" of the Bible "be treated frankly and explained for what they are worth." Accepted, that is, like the testimony of a doubtful witness! And when did the Word of God become "outmoded" and antiquated? Some of us have been simple enough to believe that "the Word of the Lord endureth forever." Were we mistaken? . . . "The problems of the New Testament, especially those attending the stories of the infancy and resurrection, are faced unflinchingly." Which means that the virgin birth and the physical resurrection of Jesus are rejected by this college Bible teacher, Prof. Streibert, as a matter of course, as also by the reviewer.

26. Religious experience pronounced infantile. Prof. Kimball Young gives us "A Realistic Approach to the Nature of Religion." Pp. 762-766. It gives us a vivid appreciation of the scientific attitude of Darwinian sociologists toward the phenomena of religious experience. Their approach is "realistic," which is to say, materialistic. Reviewing Everett Dean Martin's book, "The Mystery of Religion" and Elizabeth Goldsmith's "Life Symbols as Related to Sex Symbolism," Prof. Young approves the statements of Martin that "for the believer the religious thrill is something vital, alive and gripping. The religious experience, moreover, is projected outward from the individual's mind in the form of symbols." That is, God has nothing to do with it. It is all from within! "Since the roots of this experience lie in infantile wishes, the symbolism [which means conceptions of gods, devils, etc.] partakes of the nature of the childish psyche, rather than of the objective matter-of-factness of adulthood."

27. All religion breeds a selfish, hateful and persecuting spirit. "Connected, too, with compulsive behavior [all religious beliefs and practices, understand, being forced on one through "group psychology,"] is often a decided sense of inferiority. This gives rise in religious experience to intense humility toward objects of worship, a belief in future compensations"—here the writer quotes 'Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth'—"On the other hand this same sense of inferiority gives rise to intense cruelty and fanaticism toward those who oppose one's religious conceptions."

28. Science unalterably opposed to all religion. "Not only is religion symbolic, [which, as we saw, means here imaginative altogether], it is also fundamentally teleological. It can not escape being so. Just as science today rather prides itself on being non-teleological, a religion which does not touch ultimate purposes would be as absurd as it would be futile." Science prides itself on being "non-teleological"—that is, refusing to believe that there is a divine purpose in anything.

29. All the truth that there is in religion lies in the satisfactions which it affords to believers. "The truth of re-

ligion [the author reiterates, we are told, but evidently the reviewer approves the idea] is not the external objectivity of religious traditions, but lies within the satisfactions which the personality finds in religious practices and sentiments. As he remarks, the truth of Christianity, as religious truth, might conceivably remain unaltered, even though no such person as Jesus could be found in history." Which is to say, a "true" religion is independent of historic Christianity.

30. **A sociological definition and explanation of religion which makes it contemptible.** Religion, we are told, "is our symbolic expression of our wish that the universe were run in our interest." It "furnishes a means whereby the normal person can symbolically recover much of the lost egotism of childhood in socially acceptable ways. The neurotic, on the other hand, has flight from reality into illness for much the same purpose." Religion, then, is "flight from reality."

What the religious interest strives to do is to preserve intact an infantile image of the ideal father, perfect and "pure" and sinless, and at the same time render this image tolerant and "forgiving" of the existence in the believer of the very "sinful nature" in himself which his infantile egotism struck out of the image of the perfect one. Hence, psychologically speaking, reconciliation with the father means reconciliation of our infantile jealousy with the fact of our own maturity.

Further, religion is altogether a product of "group psychology." Says our reviewer, giving with approval the views of the author reviewed:

The insistence on religious practices by members of the community is accomplished by all the techniques of control: taboo, punishment, repressive measures generally. The enemies of the religious dogmas of the group are hated, shunned and feared, while the adherents, the members of the community, are "the saved," the "holy" ones, the "good" people. Here on a wider canvass are found once more the ambivalent attitudes of love and hatred which we saw in the individual's response to the "good Father" image, God, and the "bad father" image, the Devil.

Here is scientific scorn for the very ideas of goodness, of holiness, and of salvation, and a slander of Christianity, the religion of love. Also, note the atheistic implications. God and the devil are merely images, which means imaginations. The reviewer makes this plain as he proceeds.

Religious ceremonialism is 'non-adaptive.' The rites and gestures fulfill the essential function by giving the believer release from

feeling of sin [that, from a scientific stand-point, is all there is in it] and unworthiness because he has done the "right" thing, just as the compulsive [i. e., the insane man, who is the victim of a "religious complex"] frees himself from his fears and conflicts by his private ceremonies. Thus baptism, re-birth from water, is directly related to the neurotic compulsive bathing, hand-washing and the like, which we know, is, in turn, associated with unconscious mechanisms of wish to return to the mother and to be re-born. Likewise initiatory and purificatory rites set the faithful at rest with themselves and with their projection of themselves—their God."

This is atheism. God is simply our projection of ourselves—our imagination of a god framed upon ourselves as a model.

Here is scientific contempt for the ideas of the new birth, baptism, prayer, and even of God. But this is not all.

"The function of religion is thus to assist the ego to 'stand this universe' by re-weaving it into pleasant dream-like patterns.

The most effective change in the future, for the author, is the self-conscious acknowledgement of our conflicts, the abolishment of the infantilisms of the past religions [Christianity is here viewed as past!] and the conscious directions to "the reassembling one's personality picture so as to make it an effective instrument of orientation."

I quote two of Dr. Young's criticisms. In the first, he intimates that the religion of Jesus is a plagiarism from older systems.

"The author does not draw on primitive religions. . . Yet there is a mass of material on the psychology of the birth of the hero and semi-deity from the virgin, and on the psychology of myth-making, and the exposure of the infantilisms in early religious cosmogonies which could have been presented. . . The statement that the ceremonials of the neurotic, from whom the author draws the religious rituals, are non-adaptive, is misleading. The ceremonials are adaptive, without them the personality would go completely to pieces. They may not be socially efficient, but certainly they have a survival function in the neurotic, and especially in the mildly psychopathic personages. So, too, I think we may say that the ceremonies of religion serve a definite purpose in giving expression to infantile attitudes in socially acceptable manners. In this sense they are not completely foolish and valueless."

The author thought them so, but the scientific reviewer contends that they are good for childish folks, for hysterical women and "mildly psychopathic" men. Is it wonderful that the reviewer is delighted with Martin's "exposure of the roots of religious experience?"

31. Finally, Christianity is passing, but may or may not give way to something better.—“The future religions will grow out of the matrix of the general culture, as will future art.”

The final overthrow of Christianity is hypothetically predicted. P. 765. “The author asks, ‘Are we facing a Revival of Religion?’” This does not mean a religious revival, as Glenn Frank intimated in his address at Chapel Hill. Our reviewer proceeds to intimate the author’s answer to that question.

Whether we have a genuine improvement in the forms of religious expression, or whether we slip into emotionally retrograde religious expression, depends, thinks the author, ‘upon the kind of people whose spiritual dilemmas are to become the prevailing standards of value.’ The influence of democratic mediocrity may make for a less worthy type of religious development. The rise of the proletariat to power may bring with it considerable upsetting of the older religious forms. It may be that the revolt of labor, a revolt, not so much against capitalism as against the mechanical existence imposed on labor by modern industrialism, may bring in its turn a new religious escape [mark that: all sorts of religion are but escapes from reality; sensible people can get along very well without them, thinks the author and reviewer alike!] from the standardized, mechanical world.” Then quotes the author: It is possible therefore that a mass return to religion as a form of escape from the present civilization may take the form of a revolution in which the unconscious motive, instead of assuming traditional religious symbols, would clothe itself in the scientific jargon of contemporary economics.

Which means that the Christian religion is now about dead, and the coming “revival of religion”—the term does not imply a Christian revival—may be an up-springing of organized socialism, which makes its politics its only religion.

III. A SINGULAR SANDWICH

The foregoing intimations of Darwinian sociologists follow by some fifty pages a paper by Dr. William Louis Poteat, President of Wake Forest College. It is the second of the lectures delivered to the students of our State University by him as McNair lecturer during the last session. Apart from its apologetic feature as a defense of the Christian religion against the materialistic science of our day, its

chief feature is contempt for his brethren who are fundamentalists. He quotes as applicable to their attitude the bitter words of Erasmus spoken of the opponents of humanism: "By identifying the new learning with heresy you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance." He charges fundamentalists with teaching a system of metaphysics in their evangelistic work, and thereby driving away from the church all who do not understand our metaphysics. He says:

In Christianity God and the enveloping spirit world are mediated to our apprehension by Christ, and to be Christian is to respond in love and loyalty to the appeal of Christ. With this deep and inscrutable experience the rationalism of orthodoxy has been very free and very sure. You must do so and so, and you must accept this and that intellectual proposition; you must understand the metaphysic of "the plan," or you cannot become a Christian. What may be called the psychology of conversion is "explained" at such length that the plain man, who is little interested in metaphysics, is the more confounded, because he perceives no change of personal attitude to Christ, even though he gives genuine assent to the proposition. Inaction follows confusion, and Christian interest perishes in the bog of speculation.

In making such statements before a large body of young men, Dr. Poteat has done a grave injury to many of his Christian brethren. It is not true that all fundamentalists are ignorant, as he has intimated, nor that all who are "orthodox" are such stupid literalists in their interpretations of Scripture as he has sought to make it appear. Contempt for conservative Christian thought is not a Christian temper, and young men imbued with it are not at all likely to be attracted toward a profession of faith in Christ. Some of us have made it our business for fifty years to keep ourselves acquainted with the discoveries of science, and to know the trend of scientific thought in regard to religion. And as to requiring people to accept our metaphysics before we consent to allow them to count themselves Christians, I have never known any evangelist of any denomination who mixed metaphysics with the gospel, demanding that his hearers "accept this and that intellectual proposition." With one accord they have preached "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." I cannot recall one, from Dwight L. Moody to M. F. Ham, who set forth any metaphysic of "the plan." Much as Dr.

Poteat seems to despise the word, there is a "plan" of salvation, and it is God's plan, and not man's. Our business is to proclaim it, preaching "the Word," teaching the people out of the Scriptures, as the Master did and as His apostles did.

But the significant thing which stands out in the very number which contains Dr. Poteat's elegant but somewhat mixed and dubious apologetic—mixed and dubious because he seems quite as much concerned to rouse feelings of contempt toward fundamentalists as to inculcate faith in the Savior,—is this: That while our learned friend fills some nine pages with his effort to show that evolutionism is in harmony with the Christian faith, some seventeen pages of the same magazine are filled by writers—Messrs. Hankins, Parshley, Kimball Young, and Bixler—who, as I have shown above by abundant citations, strive to argue against the existence and personality of God, against the immortality of the soul, against the supernatural alike in the origin of the moral law and in religious experience, and against historic Christianity, even to the extent of casting doubt upon the historicity of the gospel account of Jesus and the originality of the Christian message. All this in the name of evolutionary science! More than that, one of these gentlemen expressly approves the "finding" of Bertrand Russell that religion—religion, that is, of every type—has stultified the human mind and hindered the development of the human personality, and that "traditional morality"—which means the Christian code of morals—"is too largely compounded of superstitious mandates of the God," and the opinion of Patten that the "Non-Superstitious Man, who is now evolving in our scientific age," will find in the "processes and values of life itself" and "apart from imaginative conception of the supernatural" abundant moral guidance—"fundamental rules of morality." In a word, religion is a thing that makes men fools, and as if to cap the climax. Howard Madison Parshley quotes without dissent or protest a certain writer's approval of a secret vice, which has helped to fill our asylums for the insane, and has beyond question caused the wreck of many a promising career.

What a religio-scientific sandwich we have here! It is

a slice of "modernist" religious apologetics, placed between one thin and three very thick slices of scientific infidelity.

The thin slice is found in Dr. L. L. Bernard's article in which he declares that the Greek philosophers drove "the gods" out of the universe, that Christianity is doomed, and that science can not recognize any divine or supernatural purpose in nature, or in social development, etc., etc.

Dr. Poteat is a good and able man, but he is in bad company.

IV. A QUESTION FOR NORTH CAROLINA CHRISTIANS

In the foregoing pages I have shown the patent enmity toward Christianity displayed by sundry contributors to the "Journal of Social Forces." I have demonstrated that the type of sociology taught by such men is not only anti-Christian but anti-religious. While the March number of the Journal is not quite as noticeable for its spirit of opposition to Christianity as the two previous numbers, the articles of Drs. Bernard and Barnes, not to speak of others, show the same animus. Bernard tells us in the March number, page 538, of our growing emancipation from "traditional repressions and controls," and adds: "We have freed ourselves in a measure from the tyranny of spirit worship. If now we can escape from the idols of the crowd, we may begin to be free and may realize something of the exhilaration of spirit in creative moral relations, which Bateson claims is the mental realm of the uninhibited genius." One of the idols of the crowd to which he refers is, undoubtedly, our respect for Christian morality. Mating at will, without regard to "superstitious mandates of the Gods" would be a "creative moral relation," in the opinion of such sociologists as Bernard and Barnes. "Spirit worship" includes, in sociological terminology, the worship of Him of whom Jesus said, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." Russell

Gordon Smith, of Columbia University, reviewing Miss Follett's book on "Creative Experience," says:

Suppose one grants that here we have the true scientific exposition of the behavior process, and then looks at the daily activities of human beings, at the interweaving and integrating of their desires. Do we find what Miss Follett's impassioned prose has led us to expect? We do not. We find what Sunner called the masses and what Mr. Meneken refers to somewhat more euphemistically as the boobery, engrossed in the activities of eating, sleeping, excreting, reproducing, boot-legging, cross-word puzzling, and dying, in ways more or less predetermined by the cultural crazy quilt in which they became entangled by the bloody accident of birth." Page 541.

Here is a distinct, if not very elegant, intimation that there is no God and no divine providence. The masses are involved in a "cultural crazy quilt," and birth is "a bloody accident."

In my citations from the May number above given I have but mentioned Dr. Bernard. But in that number, on page 619, he tells us that "in the nineteenth century the last great stand of both theology and metaphysics was in a joint defense against the aggressions of the new physical and biological sciences . . . A somewhat similar, though separate and weaker, defense is now being made in the fields of the mental and social sciences under the name of Fundamentalism." This intimates quite distinctly that "science" has defeated Christianity, and admits that science was the aggressor. Also, that not even the zeal and ability of the Fundamentalists can save it from final repudiation by all intelligent men. "Theology" means Christian theology. Its last great stand was made in the last century. What is being done now by Christian apologetes is weak and ineffective. Christianity is doomed to become extinct as the dodo! Again, he tells us, (page 622) that "evolution in the abstract and as an objective concept of continuity knows nothing of progress or will or purpose or any other anthropocentric concepts or points of view. To assume such a standpoint of interpretation is to read into the processes themselves personality or objective and self-existent principles and thus reduce them to the categories of theological or metaphysical dogmas or doctrines." Scientific sociology must not admit of any self-existent principle. It must have nothing to do with either theology or

metaphysics. Both of these sciences—pseudo-sciences they are, in the opinion of such men—affirm that there is a self-existent Being, Who is usually spoken of as God. But scientific sociology will have nothing to do with this “dogma.” I could multiply citations, but these must suffice.

Thus we find that in a magazine issued under the auspices of the University of North Carolina, currency is given to the views of men who despise the very words “orthodoxy,” “theology,” “metaphysics,” and “dogma.” By “metaphysics,” as we have said, they mean that view of mental science which regards the soul as a spiritual entity, distinct and separable from the body. By “dogma” they mean any doctrine which the church considers settled by the Word of God. Divine revelation, the divinity of Christ, the virgin birth of the Savior, the resurrection of Christ and of mankind at the end of the age—these and other Christian doctrines are “dogmas,” or theological “concepts” with which science will have nothing to do. These gentlemen propose to re-organize society on the basis of a new code of morals to be provided by science, and in order to this they propose to emancipate the race from all “fear of the living or the dead.” We are informed that the “Non-Superstitious Man who is now evolving” will need no religion, and that the only people who do need one are “neurotic and mildly psychopathic persons”—weak-minded, half crazy people.

In view of these facts, I submit this question to the trustees and faculty, and alumni of the University, and to the people of the State of North Carolina: Should not the faculty and trustees of our University prevent the purveying of such bald infidelity in a publication issued under the auspices and edited by professors of the institution? Shall we consent to allow the prestige of our University to be employed in the popularization of agnosticism and materialism?

I have written no word in criticism of the University. What I have condemned is the policy of the editors of the Journal of Social Forces, which, as a prominent minister writes me, “is an insult to the intelligence and to the moral

and religious convictions of our people." Already they have purveyed to their thousands of readers in four successive numbers articles that have assailed the fundamental verities of the Christian faith. During the same period they gave space to but one article favoring Christianity—Dr. Poteat's. The continuance of such a policy will not fail to injure greatly the University itself as well as the cause of evangelical Christianity. Well is it to count the search for truth the great object of the University, but when this search proceeds upon the assumption that nothing in the sphere of religion is settled—that Christianity itself is to be considered a mere temporary system, which, in the process of "evolution" is to give way to a better religion or to none at all as the high priests of Holy Science shall determine—then, in the name of my Lord, I protest against such prostitution of the agencies, the prestige and the imprimatur of an institution which, for more than a century-and-a-quarter, has been standing for the religion and the morality of the Bible.

ADDENDUM

I. THE REAL CHINAMAN IN OUR MIDST, AND HIS AMAZING DISCOVERY

Under the above title the writer published in the Charlotte Observer a partial review of an article by Judge R. W. Winston, published with editorial commendation in the November (1924) number of the Journal of Social Forces. The following is a synopsis of Judge Winston's paper:

Fifty years ago when sea and rocks were only partially explored and yet enough had been uncovered to disprove our childhood myths, the age of the world, the creation of Adam and Eve, Noah's Flood and the like . . . this question was addressed by Robert Ingersoll to William E. Gladstone: "How can the neck of orthodoxy escape the noose of Darwin?" . . . Theology and tradition have fared badly since Darwin and others began to lay bare the secrets

of nature; but religion, the right relation of man to God, is, I submit, more firmly fixed than ever. The array of evidence . . . established the theory of evolution as firmly as the theory of gravitation. Christians should investigate so stubborn a fact before wagering their all on its falsity. It really confirms one's faith in God.

Darwin did not deal with the origin of life, but with the origin of species. Prevailing opinion today is that we do not know anything about the origin of life. The confidence of those who believe that the life-process is material, and that the spiritual is a myth—that there is no First Cause—seems to have passed away. Darwin made use of God as the Creator of life. After that one divine event God apparently disappeared from the earth and its affairs and has not since re-appeared. Biology to some extent confirms the faith of the Christian idealist that God is in the very atom, since biologists declare that “even the amoeba is no fool.” LaPlace thought the hypothesis of God was not necessary. Prof. Conklin found greater evidences of the omnipotence, omnipresence and omniscience of an Infinite Being in evolution than in creation itself. Darwin himself did not believe in blind chance. Darwin’s view was not in disharmony with the God of Jesus.

Scientists admit that the missing links are still missing. Yet “how ennobling the concept of evolution: the atom; the indwelling spirit; the struggle; the ascending scale; millions upon millions of intervening years; man and his plaything world; death another name for life; back again to God.” Galileo, Bacon, Franklin, Newton, all denounced because of their discoveries. Anaesthetics opposed. Geology pronounced “a dark art, dangerous,” etc. Christians have forsaken the Bible Sabbath, yet in North Carolina a boy may be put in jail for caddying on the first day of the week. Contest today is between religion of authority and religion of reason and science. Thousands of pious persons, mostly women, would in a church of authority attain perfect emotional equilibrium. As things are they are not at peace. “Old-time religion, the revival, outpourings of the Holy Spirit, Pentecostal days are gone—and the saints are not happy.” Scientific thought once displaced by bigotry and

superstition—now both natural and spiritual processes are understood as growth. Orthodoxy must accept evolution or else plant itself upon the miraculous, the impossible.

What has science left? God, the Jesus of John; the four gospels and the epistles of Paul; the life-process, ourselves being of the process; the fruits of Christian idealism—truth, goodness, beauty; and the hope of a life to come. Under this banner all nations may enlist in a search for truth. Teachers assure us that the Far East is awake to a larger Christianity; that synthesizing our best and their best, appealing to Japanese and Chinese in a spirit of sympathy, is better than the old way—pity and condescension.

I do believe in God, that he
Made heaven and earth, and you and me;
Nay, I believe in all the host
Of Gods from Jesus down to Joss,
But honor best and reverence most
That guileless God Who bore the cross.

May we not thank Darwin for a theory of life which has broadened and humanized knowledge and dignified the concept of God?

Remarking on the above, I called attention to the fact that a Chinaman sees no inconsistency in professing any number of contradictory religions. The poetical creed of Judge Winston seems to mark him as "the Mongol in our midst," for this is precisely what he has done, proposing to accept "all the Gods from Jesus down to Joss."

And what a discovery he has made! Science has junked the whole Bible except the four gospels and the epistles of Paul, and has cut the miracles out of these. And this information comes to us in a scientific magazine under the imprimatur of our great University. Can it be true information?

II. "THE CREED AND PROGRAM OF MODERN SOCIOLOGY"

Under this caption I published citations from the articles of Drs. Bernard and Barnes in the January number of the Journal of Social Forces. My paper appeared in the Biblical Recorder, the Presbyterian Standard and the Charlotte

Sunday Observer. It brought out the following points, all being attested by abundant citations:

I. The Creed of a Modern Sociologist

1. All gods and devils were the creations of the human imagination.
2. There never has been any divine revelation of God's will to man, and never will be.
3. No extant moral code, not even that derived from the Bible, possesses divine authority. Jesus was merely a religious reformer.
4. The Christian's hope of heaven is based on a myth, "the myth of reinstatement."
5. The fall of mankind was mythical—"the myth of regression."
6. Conscience is nothing more than the product of group opinion.
7. Christianity errs as to the basic purpose of moral conduct.
8. Current Christian and Jewish teaching as to purity and modesty is all wrong. "Our sex mores go back to primitive mysticism and superstition," and to the Jewish mores, where there was developed that pernicious concept, "naked and ashamed."
9. Christianity has degraded woman, assigned her a lower position than she occupied in pagan Greece, and has retarded human progress.
10. The world today has no true code of morals and must look to science alone to supply one.

11. The Program of Modern Sociology

1. To provide the world with a scientific code of morals.
2. To assure the world that the acceptance of such a scientific code of conduct would not endanger any man's spiritual prospects, or "prevent his rapid and successful translation to the empyrean area."
3. To convince the world that "Super-hygiene" is a sufficient savior and god.
4. If the ideals of Jesus are allowed any place in the new code, it will not be because they are considered as in any sense "the product of special and unique revelation."
5. The new code must allow larger liberty of moral action to men of genius.
6. The new code will correct the low ideals of current Christian teaching.
7. The new code will supersede all moral teaching by the church.
8. The new code will be tentative and will be continually revised as science may point the way.
9. The new code will restore to mankind the ideals of Greek paganism. "With the possible exception of the teachings of Confucius," the ancient Greeks had the best ideals man has yet known.

From all which it appears that sociology of the Darwinian type proposes to overthrow the Church of Christ and Christian civilization, introduce "pluralism" by law, introduce the methods of scientific stock-breeding for the improvement of the human breed, do away with prohibition altogether, and bring back into the world all "the glory that was Greece."

NOTE—It is due the faculty of the University of North Carolina to say that the Dr. Bernard quoted above is professor in the University of Minnesota, and that Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes is professor in Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

RELATIVE TO ORDERS

The first thousand copies of this pamphlet were published by the author and distributed gratuitously. Orders are coming in, and I am encouraged to print a second edition, trusting that persons anxious to know the truth in the matter complained of will be willing to pay the cost of publication and postage, etc. Hence the price is 25 cents the copy. Five copies or more, 20 cents each postpaid. Address orders and remittances to

REV. Wm. P. McCORKLE,

Burlington, N. C.

N.C. 204 Z99M v.1 372436
Nos. 1-18

N.C. Religious Pamphlets

CALL NUMBER

N.C.

204

Z99M

Vol.

1-18

Date (for periodical)

Copy No.

N.C. 204 Z99M v.1 372436

Nos. 1-18

